



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,483	05/24/2007	Harald Vetter	EPC-001	1923
25962 7590 12/18/2009 SLATER & MATSUI, L.L.P. 17950 PRESTON RD, SUITE 1000 DALLAS, TX 75252-5793				
EXAMINER				
HOFTBERG, ROBERT JOSEPH				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2835				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/18/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/591,483

Applicant(s)

VETTER ET AL.

Examiner

ROBERT J. HOFFBERG

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2007.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 16-21 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 May 2007 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the cover of claim 16 (claim 16 reads on fig. 10C, this figure shows the jacket 2d used instead of 2, did the applicant intend that "a cover" should be "the jacket"?) the must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.
2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: 111 (fig. 4C, described in para. [0061], but not in the detailed description).
3. The drawings are objected to because in figure 4C, "95A" should be "95a".
4. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New

Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 4, 7, 11 and 16-21 are objected to because of the following informalities:
- a. Claim 4, "of the fiber-composite material" should be added at the end of the claim;
 - b. Claim 7, line 1, "the the" should be "the";
 - c. Claim 11, line 3, "the axes" lack antecedent basis;
 - d. Claim 11, line 3, "the base" lacks antecedent basis;
 - e. Claim 16, line 9, "coefficient" should be "thermal coefficient"; and
 - f. Claim 16, line 10, is the "cover" the same as the "jacket"?

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vetter (EP 0129714).

With respect to Claim 1, Vitter teaches a housing for electrical high-power-components, the housing comprising: a carrier platform (3) made from a fiber-composite

material ("glass/ a resin relationship") containing a reinforcing glass fiber component ("glass"); and at least one cover (1) connected rigidly to the carrier platform, wherein the reinforcing glass fiber component in the fiber-composite material is selected so that its thermal coefficient of longitudinal expansion deviates, in terms of magnitude, by a maximum of 30% ("5% maximum") from that of a material of the at least one cover.

With respect to Claims 2-8, Vitter further teaches the thermal coefficient of longitudinal expansion of the fiber-composite material deviates, in terms of magnitude, by a maximum of 20% ("5% maximum") from that of the material of the at least one cover (claim 2), the thermal coefficient of longitudinal expansion of the fiber-composite material deviates, in terms of magnitude, by a maximum of 10% ("5% maximum") from that of the material of the at least one cover (claim 3), a weight percent of reinforcing glass fibers lies between 50% and 90% ("70:30") (claim 4), the reinforcing glass fiber component lies between 60% and 75% ("70:30") of the fiber-composite material (claim 5), the at least one cover comprises metal ("aluminum") (claim 6), the at least one cover seals (using 8) with the carrier platform in at least one area (claim 7) and the at least one cover extends into a first recess (see fig. 2, 3 between 2s) (claim 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 9-11 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vetter (EP 0129714) and Hübner (US 3,276,241).

With respect to Claims 9 and 11, Vetter discloses the claimed invention except for attachment tabs and openings. Hübner teaches an attachment tab (19A), the attachment tab featuring at least one bore (for 20A) formed on a side (10B right side) of the carrier platform, wherein the carrier platform has an opening (21B), and wherein an attachment element (20A) connect the opening of the carrier platform to the bore of the attachment tab (see fig. 1) (claim 9), an insert (21B) in the form of a socket for holding an attachment element (20A) are installed in at least one side wall (10B right side) of the carrier platform, wherein axes of the sockets run parallel to an base (10B bottom) of the carrier platform and wherein the side wall of the carrier platform runs perpendicular to its base in an area of the sockets (see fig. 1) (claim 11). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art electronic device design at the time the invention was made to have combined the housing as disclosed in Vetter with the attachment tab and the opening as disclosed by Hübner. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. See *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). The use of attachment tab and an opening in parts to be assembled provides a simple means of mechanically coupling the carrier and cover to each other. Vitter and Hübner fail to disclose attachment tabs, openings, attachment elements and inserts. It

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to duplicate the attachment tab and the opening providing as many attachment tabs, openings, attachment elements and inserts as necessary to couple the carrier and the cover together, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

With respect to Claims 10 and 13, Vetter discloses the claimed invention except for a recess. Hübner teaches at least one recess (for 22 between sidewalls of 10B) for holding high-power components in the carrier platform (10B) (claim 10) and a recess (for 22 between sidewalls of 10B) for holding high-power components provided in a center area (see fig. 1) of the carrier platform (claim 12). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art electronic device design at the time the invention was made to have combined the housing as disclosed in Vetter with the recess as disclosed by Hübner. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. *See KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). The use of recess allows for a component mounted within the carrier to have a reduced overall height of the housing.

With respect to Claim 14, Vetter discloses the claimed invention except for an in at least one cover wall. Hübner teaches at least one opening (21A) for attaching high-power components is provided in at least one cover wall (10A left side). It would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art electronic device design at the time the invention was made to have combined the housing as disclosed in Vetter with the opening as disclosed by Hübner. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. *See KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). The use of an opening allows for the carrier with the high-power components to be attached to the carrier using an economical attachment element.

With respect to Claim 15, Vetter discloses the claimed invention except for an impregnating opening. Hübner teaches at least one impregnating opening (21A) is provided in a side wall (10A left side) of the cover. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art electronic device design at the time the invention was made to have combined the housing as disclosed in Vetter with the opening as disclosed by Hübner. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. *See KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). The use of an impregnating opening allows for the carrier to be attached to the carrier.

10. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vetter (EP 0129714) and Vetter (US 6,409,545).

Vetter ('714) discloses the claimed invention except for openings for holding electrical feedthrough sockets. Vetter ('545) teaches openings (for 5 in 1) for holding electrical feedthrough sockets (5) between inside and outside of the housing are formed in the lower portion of the housing. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art electronic device design at the time the invention was made to have combined the housing as disclosed in Vetter ('714) with the opening as disclosed by Vetter ('545). All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. *See KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). The use of openings for holding electrical feedthrough sockets provides for the high power components within the housing to be electrically coupled to a circuit.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 16-21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objection(s), set forth in this Office action, above.
12. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claim 16 and all claims dependent thereof are allowable over the art of record because the prior art does not teach or suggest that a two parallel mounting planes, containing two plastic platforms are made from a fiber-composite material and a jacket arranged between the plastic platforms and connected rigidly to these platforms, openings for holding electrical feedthrough sockets are formed in each plastic platform,

and wherein a reinforcing glass fiber component in each plastic platform is set so that its coefficient of longitudinal expansion of the plastic platform deviates, in terms of magnitude, by $\beta < 30\%$ of that of a [jacket]. The aforementioned limitations in combination with all remaining limitations of the respective claims are believed to render said claims 7 and all claims dependent thereof patentable over art of record.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 4,402,813 discloses which the reinforcing glass fiber component lies between 60% and 70% of the fiber-composite material (col. 8, ll. 29-30).
14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert J. Hoffberg whose telephone number is (571) 272-2761. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 4:30 PM Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jayprakash Gandhi can be reached on (571) 272-3740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RJH 12/11/09

/ROBERT J HOFFBERG/
Examiner, Art Unit 2835